REMARKS

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 6, and 10 to recite the limitation of an origin server. In view of this amendment, the claims are considered to be patentable over *Hasebe*.[1] Applicant cancels claims 4, 9, and 13.

As best understood, and with reference to *Hasebe*'s FIG. 8:

- the *Hasebe* information distribution devices **60**[2] are considered to correspond to Applicant's content servers;

- the *Hasebe* communication network exchange devices **40** are considered to correspond to Applicant's routers; and

- the *Hasebe* user terminal devices **10** are considered to correspond to Applicant's clients.

In discussing claim 9, the office action suggests that the *Hasebe* local unit **200** is considered to correspond to Applicant's origin server. *Hasebe* describes there local units **200** as being composed of a network exchange device **40** and an information distribution device **60**.[3] Applicant draws attention to *Hasebe*'s FIG. 10, which shows three local units **200**, each of which includes a network exchange device and an information distribution device **60**.

The office action's proposed association of elements from *Hasebe* with corresponding elements in the claims means that the "content server" **60** is somehow "inside," or a constituent part of, the "origin server" **200**. This would mean that the purported "origin server" **200** would be busy whenever the content server **60** is serving content. This defeats the purpose of having an origin server be separate from the content server.

---

[1] *Hasebe*, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,215,570.
[2] In referring to the reference numerals in *Hasebe*, the letters "A-C" are omitted throughout this discussion.
[3] *Hasebe*, col. 11, lines 16-23.

As discussed on page 1 of the specification, the purpose of having separate content servers and origin servers is to relieve congestion. In a content delivery system, there are many content servers and a limited number of origin servers. The idea is that the origin server fields requests for content and delegates delivery of that content to the content servers. Applicant's invention is directed to how an origin server ensures selection of a content server that is appropriate to the client.

It is clear that the local unit **200** does not carry out the function of an origin server as recited in the claim. In fact, it would make no sense for a local unit **200** to give the client **10** an address of an autonomous system **30**. After all, if the client **10** has already been able to reach the local unit **200**, it must already have the address of the autonomous system **30**. Otherwise the client **10** would not have been able to reach the local unit **200** in the first place.

In *Hasebe's* FIG. 8, a communication network exchange device **20** (with which the user terminal device **10** is in communication) is shown as already having the address to an autonomous system **30**. However, no mention is made of where this address comes from. Applicant's invention is directed to providing such an address.

As amended, claim 1 recites the step of identifying an autonomous system having content servers that have the desired content, and doing so in response to a request received at the origin server. *Hasebe* neither teaches nor suggests this step.

In *Hasebe*, the autonomous system is not identified in response to a request for content. In *Hasebe*, by the time a local unit **200** receives a request for content, the communication network exchange device **20** already knows the address to the autonomous system **30**.

Claim 10 recites a computer readable medium having software for carrying out the method of claim 1. Hence, claim 10 is allowable for reasons discussed in connection with claim 1.

Claim 6, as amended, recites an origin server that provides an address identifying an autonomous system, and does so in response to a request for content. This is neither disclosed nor suggested by *Hasebe*.

In *Hasebe*, the local unit **200** responds to requests for content by retrieving desired content from the information distribution device **60** and serving that content. The local unit **200** does not respond to a request for content by providing an address of any sort. This is because the address to the autonomous system **30** is already known. If it were not already known, the local unit **200** could never have received a request for content to begin with.

The remaining claims are dependent on either claims 1, 6, or 10. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claims 1, 6, and 10.

Now pending in this application are claims 1-3, 5, 6-8, and 10-14. Of these, claims 1, 6, and 10 are independent.

Applicant encloses a petition for a three-month extension of time, and the required fee. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket "11125-017001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Aug 26, 2004

Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20928275.doc